FOR MYSORE STATE

Public (C.P.) (1953) Department.

Ms SERIES.

G.O. Ms NO. 1853

Dated 14-7-1953

passed

Superintendent.

G.O. at P 9 cf.

[Despatch Abstract.]

Community projects - South Kanara Area - Communications - construction of a foot bridge at Melaperkar in Tenkarperkar village - Estimate - Sanctioned.

Ref.C.No.1105-53-A. Office of the Project Executive Officer, South Kanara, Mangalore, dated 15-4-53.

From

Sri G. Simhadri, B.A.,
Project Executive Officer,
South Kanara, Mangalore.

To

7803

The Director of Community Projects &
Ex. Officio Secretary to Government,
Ft. St. George, M a d r a s, 9.

COMMUNITY PROJECTS & SPECIAL OFFICER, (COMMUNITY PROJECTS)
24 APR 1953
PUBLIC (C. P.) DEPARTMENT
MADRAS

Sir,

COMMUNITY PROJECTS: South Kanara - Block I - Communications - Construction of a footbridge at Tenkayekkar - Estimate - Sanction-requested.

I submit herewith an estimate for the construction of a footbrid at Melayekkar in Tenkayekkar village. The particulars required are furnished ~~hxxw~~ below.

1. Block No. I.

2. Name of work - Construction of a footbridge at Melayekkar in Tenkayekkar village, across the poramboke channel in S.No.47.

3. Whether the work was approved by the Firka and Project Advisory Committees and whether the work is included in the programme for 1952 - 53. — Yes.

4. Cost of work - Rs.4200/-.

5. Villagers' contribution - The Panchayat Board, Yekkar has promised to contribute 1/3rd cost ~~of~~ which comes to Rs.1400/-.

6. Expenditure to be borne by the Community Project - Rs.2800/-.

7. Remarks:- The proposal is to construct a footbridge across the poramboke channel in S.No.47 of Tenkayekkar village at the locality known as Melayekkar. This village is about 3 miles away from Bajpe, the Mandi centre for block I. The villagers have to cross ~~through~~ this stream to go to Bajpe which is their marketing centre. The construction of a footbridge at the proposed site will benefit the village as a whole including a large number of school-children who have to cross this stream to attend the village school. The cost of the work is estimated at Rs.4200/-. The Panchayat Board, Yekkar has promised to meet 1/3rd of the cost which works out to Rs.1400/-. The ~~balance~~ balance of Rs.2800/- has to be borne by the Community Project. I recommend that the estimate may be sanctioned for Rs.2800/-.

PROJECT EXECUTIVE OFFICER. 17/4

Enclosure: Estimate in duplicate.

No 17/4

To C/P Technic

24/4

Pub (CP. audit) Dept.

Memo No 7869 Pub (CP. Audit) 53-1 dt. 2. 5-53

Sub. Community Projects- South Kanara District.
Communications- Construction of a foot bridge at Melayekkar in Shenkayekkar village.
Ref. From the PEO. Mangalore - ref. C No 1105/53A dt 15/4/53

The estimate and plan received from the PEO with the letter cited above are herewith returned.

The total of items in the abstract estimate, ~~as~~ noted ~~by the PEO~~ as Rs 4,200 appears to be wrong. This should be ~~verified.~~ rectified.

2. The site chosen for the foot bridge is on a sharp curve and the ~~right~~ left bank will be subjected to further erosion when a masonry structure or other obstruction is put up. A site nearby, on a fairly straight reach may be chosen. The depth of the sandy strata should be ascertained by probing and the nature of the rocky soil on the left bank should be clearly examined in further detail. It is also necessary to provide for foundations based as much on actual nature of the soil as could be determined in advance.

3. It is not clear from the report whether the Stream is ~~a~~ perennial or if it is dry during summer. This ~~will~~ determine whether ~~open foundations and masonry piers may be resorted to, if the bottom of sand is only thin~~ and the thickness of the Sandy Stratum will determine whether open foundations and masonry piers may be resorted to.

A copy of the Budget estimate approved by the C.P.A has been forwarded to the PEO. separately. The PEO is requested to ~~play~~ the works and obtain ~~equitable contribution for the works so as it is observed that of the present estimate the full number of works could be carried within reasonable bounds of the Budget estimate.~~

The estimate may be revised suitably

Sr. No 1/5/53.

To
The PEO. Mangalore
(with enclosure)

(By dog/post) 5/5/53

5/5/53 7.5.53

R.D. 4 weeks. Ex. Reminder 1-6-53.

RD 5 weeks.

5

Ref.C.No.1105/58-B.

Project Executive Office, S.Kanara,
Mangalore, dated 26-6-1958.

23763

From

Sri G.Simhadri, B.A.,
Project Executive Officer,
Mangalore.

To

The Director of Community Projects
and Ex-Officio Secretary to Govt.,
Fort St.George, Madras 9.

.....

Sub: Community Projects - South Kanara District - Communications - Construction of a foot bridge at Melayekkar in Tenkayekkar village - Estimate - Report - Submitted.

Ref: Government Memorandum No. 7369,Public (C.P.Audit) 58-1 dated 2-5-1958.

*****

The defects pointed out in the Government Memorandum cited have been rectified. The observations contained in the Government Memorandum, have been replied to by the Assistant Engineer in his report No.103-E dated 24-6-1958 which is enclosed for favour of perusal. His remarks are endorsed.

2. The cost of the work is Rs. 3,400/- The Panchayat Board, Yekkar has promised 1/3rd contribution which works out to Rs. 1,134/- The balance of Rs. 2,266/- has to be borne by the Community Project. The average cost for a foot bridge to be borne by the Community Project, as provided in the draft programme submitted by me in reply to Government Memorandum No. 6198, Public (C.P.)-I/58-1 dated 1-4-1958 is Rs. 2,000/-

p.t.o.

In this case, the expenditure to be borne by the Community Project is slightly more than this figure. But there are several foot-bridges, sanctioned and to be sanctioned, the cost of which is far below this amount, and it will be possible to keep down the expenditure to the average fixed. I, therefore recommend that the estimate may be sanctioned for Rs. 2,266/-

PROJECT EXECUTIVE OFFICER.

Enclosure: Estimate in duplicate.

T/27.6.

105/2416

Sir,

Subject: Constructing a foot-bridge at Mela yekkar in Tenka yekkar village.

Ref: C.No. 1105/53 A dated 15-6-53.

Para 2.

The correct total is verified to be Rs 3400/- It is since corrected.

Para 3.

The site is verified by me and it is not so sharp a bend as shown in the key map. This site is better suited than the site higher up or lower down. At this point there is not much scour and I think there will not be any erosion on the banks on account of the masonry structure, as this reach is fairly straight.

There is sand flowing in the stream. Laterite pit on the left side can not be now dug. There are granite boulders seen on the surface. This shows that the soil is hard mixed with fair sized boulders and this will be a good soil for the foundation. The original proposal will be suitable and no change is necessary.

For the central pier the soil met with sand up to a depth of about 12 ft. verified by probing and for the height above the soil is again sandy up to a depth of about 14 ft. Wooden pile as proposed may be suitable.

Para 4

Local enquiry shows that the stream gets dried up towards the second half of March. Open foundation for the piers and the foundation if resorted to the cost of concrete and foundation for about 12 to 15 ft. below the bed of the stream will involve an additional cost of Rs 3000/- to 4000/- where as if piles are used and driven up to the point of refusal and even if extra length is required the same piles may be spliced which will increase the cost by about Rs 100 or Rs 200/- It is therefore not worthwhile considering an open foundation for the piers and abutment as in case of the above foot bridge.

Para 5

This may be replied to from the Office.

A. A. Gopalan
Asst. Engineer 24/6/53.
for all angadi

24/6

Pub (CP. Audit) Dept

(C No 7869/53)

G.O. Ms. 1853 dated 14-7-53.

Abstract:- Community Projects. South Kanara Area Communications - Construction of a foot bridge at Melayekkas in Tenkayekkar Village - - Estimate - Sanctioned

Read - from the PEO. Mangalore reg C No 1105/53B dated 26-6-53 ____

Order:-

Sanction is accorded to an expenditure not exceeding Rs 2267/- (Rupees Two Thousand two hundred and Sixty seven only) being two thirds of the estimated cost of Rs 3400/- for the Construction of a foot bridge at Melayekkar in Tenkayekkar village. The balance of Rs 1133/- required for the Completion of the work should be met by Contribution from the beneficiaries This sanction is Counted against the provision in item II H of the project estimate approved by the CPA in their letter No CPA 33/5/52 dated 31-3-53.

2. The expenditure should be debited to "63 B. Community Development Projects. II Community Projects & Communications - & works".

3. The PEO. Mangalore should get the work executed according to the plan and estimate hereunto returned approved and Submit a Copy of the Completion report to Govt in due course

By order,
9.7.53

(By regd. post)
The PEO Mangalore (with enclosures)
The A.G. Madras
The Secy. C.P.A. Rashtrapati Bhavan New Delhi
The Collector, South Kanara
Sri A. Balakrishnan B.A.B.L. Madras (AG. Madras)
Pub (CP. Accts) Dept.
Pub (CP. Tech.) Dept.
SF-2
Spare

C.B. 5 months entered in C.B. as item no. 148.
Copies sent

~~3405/-~~

Design

Design of deck slab panels

clear span 3'6"

Dead weight $3'6" \times 1'0" \times \frac{1}{6} \times 150 = 27$

Extra for kerbs, rails $\underline{\quad 8}$

35

Live load at 80 lb/ft² $3.5 \times 1.0 \times 80 = 280$

Total 315 or 320

Stiffness formula $W = 150\ b d^3 / L^2$

$d^3 = \frac{320 \times 3\frac{1}{2} \times 3\frac{1}{2}}{150 \times 12} = 2.18$ $d = 1.29$

Hence the thickness of 2' formula is quite sufficient

2) Dead wt of deck $= 21 \times 5 \times \frac{1}{6} \times 150 = 875$

Extra for kerbs, rails $= 300$

Extra wt of beams $2 \times 21 \times \frac{2}{3} \times 1.50 = 1400$

2575

Live load $21 \times 3'9" \times 80 = 6300$

Total 8875 lb

14 Load on each beam $\frac{8575}{2} = 4438$ lbs

$d^3 = \frac{4438 \times 2.1 \times 21}{150 \times 5} = 1580$; $d = 11.62$ in

Beam of section of 8"x12" is sufficient.

B Kanyawimalan Lec
7.5 8/4/53

~~Peter Gee~~

Load adjustment

1) Ground method
weight of beam ½ mile live and local load

2) Wood ½ mile live load local load

3) Sand 46 mile

4) Cement 17 M.M.K. + 2½ M C.T Manyinlwe
+ ½ mile live load
(via Yenyaung)

Acknowledgement: I would like to express my deepest thanks to the head of my department

B Kanyawimalan Lec
4.E 8/4/53.

Detail sheet to accompany the estimate for Construction of a foot bridge at Yelahanka

Quantity	Description of wor	Rate. Rs.	A.	P.	Per.	Amount. Rs.	A	P.	Total.
	1) Earthwork excavation in all soils except rock requiring blasting.								
2000 c ft	S.T. 20 ft.	21	6	0	1000 c ft	21	6	0	21-6-0
	2) Concrete broken stone 1½" size								
C.R.	1:4:8. 100 c ft								
100 c ft	Metal 1½" size	23	0	0	100 c ft	23	0	0	
50 c ft	Mortar 1:4 as below	111	8	0	"	55	12	0	
½ No.	Mason	2	12	0	each	1	6	0	
5 Nos.	Man Mazdoor	1	8	0	"	7	8	0	
4 Nos.	Woman Mazdoor	0	12	0	"	3	0	0	
100 c ft	Lead for metal ½ mile lead load	12	11	0	100 c ft	13	11	0	
	Sundries					0	3	0	103-8-0
						103	8	0	
	Sub class. Cement mortar 1:4								100 c ft
100 c ft	Sand	2	8	0	100 c ft	2	8	0	
100 c ft	Cement	87	8	0	Ton	87	8	0	
2 c ft	Lead for cement 17 M.R. + 2½ M.C.T	66	10	6		16	10	8	25-12-6
	½ Mile lead load	77	0	0	100 c ft	16	1	6	24-0-0 C.T 5-0-0 1-0-0
100 c ft	Mixing charges	9	8	0	"	9	8	0	HD load 10-14-0
	Sundries					0	5	4	66-10-6
						113	0	0	111/8/0
	3) Random rubble in C.M. 1:4								100 c ft
110 c ft	Rough stone	16	0	0	100 c ft	17	9	7	
54 c ft	Mortar 1:4.	111	8	0	"	37	14	7	
5 Nos.	Mason 2nd class	2	12	0	each	13	12	0	
4 Nos.	Man Mazdoor.	1	8	0	"	6	0	0	
4 Nos.	Women mazdoor	0	12	0	"	3	0	0	
110 c ft	Lead for ½ mile lead load	12	11	0	100 c ft	13	15	4	
	Sundries					0	4	6	
						95	0	0	95/-

P.W.D. V-39—17 203—26-1-33.

Data sheet to accompany the estimate for _____

Quantity	Description of wor	Rate. RS.	A.	P.	Per.	Amount. RS.	A	P.	Total.
	4) Excavation supplying best ... piles 1'-0" dia with bamboo headed off ... ends.								
	mounted to receive shoe					1	C	ft	
1 C ft	C.W Large accuracy	7	4	0	1 C ft / 100 C ft	7	4	0	
1 C ft	Lead 1½ M.S. headboard	10	14	0	100 C ft	0	1	9	
	Removing boards etc					0	1	3	
						7	7	0	7-7-0
	5) Conveying, fixing in position and driving 12" dia wooden piles in all soils except rocks with ... cylindrical ... shoes ...								
	6" piles SD 232A	0	2	0	Rft				12 ft
	Per Qty. " 232B	0	4	0					
ANO	Iron Monkey for lifting monkey	1	8	0	Each	6	0	0	
1 NO	Pile driver	3	0	0	"	3	0	0	
	Hoisting the pile hanging with tackle, fixing for guiding, working etc					0	4	0	
	Hence for 1 ft pile twice 232B	0	8	0		9	4	0	
	Taking that on an average 9 A ft in driven per day.								
	Rate per R ft 9-4-0 / 6	= 1	8	4					128-0
	6) Conducting wood (Meriol wood) ... weighing ... per cft up in Large beams				1 C ft				
1 C ft	C.W Large beams	7	4	0	1 C ft	7	4	0	
1 C ft	Lead as above	10	14	0	100 C ft	0	1	9	
½ NO	Carpenter	3	6	0	Each	1	11	0	
1 NO	Iron Monkey	1	8	0	"	1	8	0	
	Sundries					0	1	3	
						10	10	0	10-10-0
	7) Conducting wood (Meriol wood) ... weighing ... per cft up in small beams				1 100 C ft				
1 C ft	C.W small scantling	7	0	0	C ft	7	0	0	
1 C ft	Lead as above	10	14	0	100 C ft	0	1	9	
½ NO	Carpenter	3	6	0	Each	1	11	0	

P.W.D. V–39—57,603—4-4-51.

Data sheet to accompany the estimate for

Quantity.	Description of work.	Rate. RS.	A.	P.	Per	Amount. RS.	A.	P.	Total.
8)	Pointing with cement sand [illegible]					100	2		
8½ Nos	cement mortar	0	4	0	No.	2	2	0	
1½ NO.	Ram Mazdoor	1	8	0	each	2	4	0	
	Sundries, viz charki, brushes, fuel etc					0	10	0	
						5	0	0	5/-
9)	Rough stone dry [illegible] for [illegible] foundation 100 cft								
100 cft	Rough stone	1½	0	0	100 cft	17	9	7	
1 NO.	Woodcutter	3	0	0	each	3	0	0	
3 NOs.	Ram Mazdoors	1	8	0	"	4	8	0	
2 NOs	Woman mazdoor	0	12	0	"	1	8	0	
100 cft	Load as above	12	11	0	100 cft	13	15	4	
	Sundries					0	7	1	
	Total					41	0	0	41/-
10)	Pointing rough stone [illegible] with C.M. 1:4.								
3 cft	C.M. 1:4	11	8	0	100	3	6	3	100 sft
1½ NO.	Mason	2	12	0	each	4	2	0	
½ NO.	Ram Mazdoor	1	8	0	"	0	12	0	
1 NO.	Woman Mazdoor	0	12	0	"	0	12	0	
	Sundries					0	2	6	9.20
						9	10	0	9.50
11)	Providing and fixing wire netting 1/4" mesh and plastering [illegible] with C.M. 1:4, 3/4" thick without cost of wire mesh etc								
7 C.ft	C.M. 1:4	11	8	0	100 cft	7	12	11	
2 NO.	Bruck layer	2	12	0	each	5	8	0	
½ NO.	Ram Mazdoor	1	8	0	"	0	12	0	
3 NOs	Woman mazdoor	0	12	0	"	2	4	0	
100 sft	1/2" mesh wire netting	20	0	0	100 sft	16	4	11	or 1668
						20	0	0	

P.W.D. V-39—57,603—4-4-51.

Data sheet to accompany the estimate for

Quantity.	Description of work.	Rate.			Per	Amount.			Total.
		RS.	A.	P.		RS.	A.	P.	
	Certified that the leads are correct to the best of my knowledge								
	[illegible] 8/4/53								
	T.E. (S.P.W.D.)								
	[illegible] 24/6/53 A.E. C.P.								

DETAILED ESTIMATE.

421,104—17-11-52. C.P. 156 (1).

District

Taluk

Village and Survey

Date and cost of original construction

Name and number of work

Date and cost of last repairs

Details of work.	Number.	Measurement in feet. Length.	Breadth.	Depth.	Area or contents.	Total quantity of each description of work.
1) Earthwork excavation in [illegible] soil					[illegible] cft.	
2) Brick masonry in						
Right abutment	1	11'-6"	6'-0"	13'-0"	897	
Pier for right					103	
					1000 cft.	
3) Concrete in [illegible]					2 cft.	14.8
Foundation Right abutment	1	11'-6"	6'-0"	1'-0"	69	
Pier Right [illegible]	1	8'-0"	5'-6"	0'-6"	14	
					83	90 cft.
3)a Foundation masonry in						
Right abutment foundation	1	6'-6"+20	6'-0"	20'-0"	645	
Pier Portion	1	9'-6"	6'-0"	2'-6"	171	
Pier Steps	1	4'-0"	2'-0"	8'-0"	96	
Right return	1	4'-0"	4'-6"	6'-6"	124	
					936	940 cft.
4) Supplying and [illegible]	2	feet	1'-0"	thick	with	boulders
packed dry [illegible]						thick
Middle guard feet	2×2	22/7 ×1	0"/9 ×1'-0	26'-0	21.71	
Piers for cross beams for foundation	2×2	22/7 ×1	0"/9 ×1'-0	1'-0"	3.14	
Total					84.85	85 cft.
5) Concreting in [illegible]						
12" thick [illegible]						
Next the pier	2	11'-0"			22	
End pier	2	14'-0"			28	50 cft.

Details of work.	Number.	Measurement in feet. Length.	Breadth.	Depth.	Area or contents.	Total quantity of each description of work.
1) Excavating trench for foundations						
Beams	2	45-0	0-8	1-0	60	
Ends for foundations	2	0-7	0-8	1-0	9	
Total					69	
add for braces if necessary					1 eft	70 eft
Excavating trench for						
Main beams for gates	2	5-0	0-6	0-8	3 33	
Decking	1	45-0	5-0	0-2	37 50	
Posts	2x10	2-6	0-3	0-3	3-13	
struts	2x10	2-6	0-3	0-3	3-13	
Hand rail upt	2	45-0	0-3	0-2	3 75	
Cross rail	2	45-0	0-2	0-1½	1 88	
Kerbs	2	45-0	0-3	0-3	3 75	
Braces	2x2	10-0	0-6	0-3	5-00	
Ends for grounds					3 53	
					35-00	35-00 eft
Excavating with just coal 1ch 2 circuits						
for Beams	2	45-0	-	3-4	300	
Posts	2x10	2-6		1-0	50	
struts	2x10	2-6		1-0	50	
Hand rails	2	45-0		0-10	75	
central rail	2	45-0		0-7	53	
Decking	2	45-0		5-0	450	
Ends	2	45-0		1-0	90	
Total					1068	1100 ft
2) Rough stone dry pitching for revetment						
left bank of river	2	4-0	1-0	19-0	152	
Right bank straight portion	1	4-0	1-0	6-6	26	
Quadrant	2	$\frac{22}{7} \times \frac{13-0}{4} \times 1$		$0 \times \frac{6-6}{2}$	66	

DETAILED ESTIMATE. 421,104—17-11-52. C.F. 150 (1).

District — Taluk

Village and Survey — Date and cost of original construction

Name and number of work — Date and cost of last repairs

Details of work.	Number.	Measurement in feet. Length.	Breadth.	Depth.	Area or contents.	Total quantity of each description of work.
1 Turning [illegible]						
2 [illegible]	1	4-0		6-6	2-64	
	2	2-2		5-5	66	
					92	100
11) Providing and [illegible] and planting [illegible]						
Pier middle	2	2/3	1-0	12-0	94	
End pier	2	2/3	1-0	8-0	50	
					144	150 in ft
12) Providing and fixing 1-0" dia along with jute						
Jute ring clamp	1	6-0			6-0	6 Rft
13) Splicing 1-0" dia jute with necessary holes and clamps					L.S	
14) Providing and fixing upon wheels for 1-0" dia jute						L.S
15) Providing and fixing 4 to 6" Ø jute					L.S	
16) Lubricating with [illegible]					L.S	
17) Petty [illegible]					L.S	

E. A. Comfort
24/6/53
AE CP

Asthagiri Chinnathambi
D.E.
6/21/53

Details of work.	Number.	Measurement in feet.			Area or contents.	Total quantity of each description of work.
		Length.	Breadth.	Depth.		

Melayekkar in Punkayekkar. Kilmore

Abstract Estimate.

C.P. 160. (3).

Quantity. (1)	Description of work. (2)	Item number in the schedule of rates. (3)	Rate. (4)	Per (5)	Total. (6)	Amount. (7)
			Rs. A. P.		Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.
1000 cft	Earthwork excavation in all sorts of soil including disposing of the soil		2 5 0	100 cft	21 0 0	21
900 cft	Cement masonry above 2 ft. in C.M. 1:3		10 3 8	100 cft	93 0 0	93
120 cft	Random rubble in C.M. 1:4		9 2 8	100 cft	110 0 0	870
85 cft	Supplying best C.I. pipes 1'-0" dia with bends fitted off and ends provided to receive rings.		7 7 0	1 cft	632 0 0	632
50 cft	Conveying, fixing and providing and driving 12" dia pipes on all sorts of soil except rock including					75
70 cft	Cement pile driving set complete					
cft	Sundry wood work supplied & put up in large screens		10 10 0	cft	648 0 0	744
35 cft	Sundry wood work supplied & put up in small screens		9 2 0	"	320 0 0	324
1100 sft	Removing white wash coat lair 2 coats		5 0 0	100 sft	55 0 0	55
3600 cft	Rough stone dry packing for foundations		4 1 0	100 cft	144 0 0	144
100 cft	Pointing rough stone with C.M. 1:4		9 2 0	100 sft	10 0 0	9
	Supervision charges at 5 per cent.				2807 0 0	
				Grand total, Estimate ...		2967

To be paid on actuals supported by MPR etc

Divisional officer (or other countersigning officer to be named).

Sanctioned for 19 -19

Signature and designation of the officer submitting this estimate.

Collector or other sanctioning officer (to be named).

Tahsildar or other officer (to be named).

Specification.

C.P. 150 (2)—342,006—24-10-51.

District

Taluk

Village No.

Name of Work No.

ESTIMATE ABSTRACT.

Budget head

Main head

Sub-head

Amount of estimate Rs. 3400

Sanction number and date

To be carried out by Community Project

Abstract Estimate.

C.P. 160. (2).

Quantity. (1)	Description of work. (2)	Item number in the schedule of rates. (3)	Rate. (4)	Per (5)	Total. (6)	Amount. (7)
			Rs. A. P.		Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.
	B.F.					2967
150 Sqft 11a)	Plastering ... with nails etc		16 6	Sft		35
	12) Providing & fixing 3" dia iron tube ...					25
	13) Fixing 3" dia pipe with necessary bolts & clamps ... 5.					50
	14) Providing cast iron ...				40 00	40
	15) Providing cast iron 4" to 6" long pickets ...				50 0 0	50
	16) Reinforcement including bending and erection ... 5.					128
	17) Petty supervision charges at 2½% of item 16 to 15					80
						3400
	Supervision charges at 5 per cent.					
					Grand total, Estimate ...	3400/-

Divisional officer (or other countersigning officer to be named).

Sanctioned for 19 -19 .

Signature and designation of the officer submitting this estimate.

Collector or other sanctioning officer (to be named).

Talukdar or other officer (to be named).

O.F. 150 (2)—342,006—24-10-61.

Estimated Cost Rs 3400 ✓

Amount of Contribution Rs 1133 ✓
at 1/3.

Amount of Sanction Rs 2267- ✓

District

Taluk

Village No.

Name of Work No.

ESTIMATE ABSTRACT.

Budget head

Main head

Sub-head

Amount of estimate 3400/-

Sanction number and date

To be carried out by

Sanctioned for Rs 2267/-
(Rupees Two thousand two hundred
and sixty seven only)

for D.C.P.

2/57-58 9-7-53

34857 27 44

From
Sri J.Sivanandam, I.A.S.,
Inspector of Municipal Councils
and Local Boards, Madras-1.

To
The Secretary to Government,
Health, Education and Local Administration Department, Madras.

DEPUTY SECRETARY (C.P.) 28 DEC 1953 AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENT

L.Dis.65470-53-dated 21-12-53

--

S i r,

Sub:- Contribution - Yekkar Panchayat - South Kanara District - Rs.2,000/- to the Community Projects Department for the formation of a road from Yekkar to Niddodi - Sanction of.

--

I forward herewith for orders of Government, the letter of the President, Yekkar (South Kanara) Panchayat No.17-53-dated 1-8-53 requesting sanction to the proposal of the Yekkar Panchayat to pay a contribution of Rs.2,000/- to the Community Projects Department for the formation of a road from Yekkar to Niddodi.

2. The income and expenditure of the Panchayat as per its budget estimate for 1953-54 are Rs.3,052/- and Rs.4,278/- respectively. The Panchayat thus works at a deficit of Rs.1,226/- As this contravenes condition No.5 of the conditions set forth in G.O.No.1939, L.A., dated, 3-10-53, I refer the matter to Government for orders.

3. I may, however, mention that the Panchayat had a cash balance of Rs.4,742-15-9 on the date of application and its budget for 1953-1954 is expected to close with a surplus of Rs.480/-

for Inspector.

Copy to the Secretary to Government (Agriculture, (C.P.Audit) Department with reference to Govt.Memo.No.25319-Public (C.P.audit)53-2 dated 25-9-53.

pks- pks-26-12-54

29 ~~37~~ ~~54-55~~

Agri (Cp. Audit) Dept

Memo No. 5409 Agri (Cp. Audit) 54-1 dt. 29 1/54

Sub:- Community Projects- South Kanara Area- Communications- Forming a road from Yekkar to Niddodi- Contribution by the Panchayat Board of Yekkar.

Ref:- G.O. Ms. 1183 Reb (CP) dated 5-5-1953.

A sum of Rs 2400 was sanctioned towards the Construction of culverts on the Yekkar-Niddodi road, in the G.O. cited. The road was to have been formed by the villagers with a contribution of Rs 2000/- by the Panchayat Board of Yekkar. But the Inspector of Municipal Councils and local boards has stated that the Panchayat board is a ~~Select~~ Class II Panchayat with a poor income and that its finances may not permit ~~the Contribution of such an~~ OR 2000 ~~expenditure~~. A sum of Rs 2000/- however is available as a token contribution only. The PEO. Mangalore is requested to ascertain and report urgently, whether the beneficiaries are willing to complete the work of forming the road with this Contribution.

The PEO is also requested to report the progress made todate on the formation of the road and also the work remaining to be done

28/1/54.

To
The P.E.O. Mangalore
South Kanara Dist.

Copy to fol. no 253-9/53

Rp. 3 weeks.

28-1-54

28/1/54

Agri (CP. Audit)

Memo No 5409 Agri (CP. Audit) 54-2 dt 18-3-54

Sub:- Cls. South Kanara Area - Communications
Constructions of a foot bridge at Melayekkar
in Tenkayekkar Village - Further orders

Ref- 1) G.O Ms. ~~1880~~ 1853 Pub (CP) dated ~~23-4-53~~ 14-7-53
2) From the PEO. Mangalore Ref CNo 932/53-B
dated 8-2-54

A sum of Rs 2267 was sanctioned in the G.O cited, out of an estimate for ~~Rs~~ Rs 3400/- for Constructing a foot bridge at Melayekkar in Thenkayekkar Village The balance of Rs 1133/- requires to Complete the work was to have been contributed by the beneficiaries. As neither the beneficiaries nor the Panchayat board of Yekkar, ~~are~~ is in a position to make any contribution the PEO Mangalore is also permitted, as a special case, to incur the balance of expenditure required to Complete the work

The entire expenditure should be debited to "63 B. Community Development projects. J. Communications - 1. Works."

The work should be Completed early and a Completion report sent.

4-3-54

18.3.54

18.3.54

To The PEO. Mangalore SK Dist
The Agt. Madras
The Secy. CPA. Regal Bldgs. New Delhi
The Collector, S. Kanara
The Inspector of Local Bds & Municipal Councils Madras
Sri A. Balakrishnan BA BL Inspr, AG, Madras
Agri (CP.) Accts Dept
Agri (CP Tech) Dept

File CNo. 32485/53.
G.O. Ms No 1853 Pub (CP) dt 14.7.53

8F - 2 Vrs.
Spare - 2

RD 2 months

4,2
32

Memo No 5409 Agri(CP. Audit)54-3 dt 18-3-54

Sub:- CPs- S.K. Area- Communications- Forming a road from Yekkar to Niddodi and a road from Permude to Mangalpet- Proposals.

Ref- From the PEO. Mangalore rg CNo. 932/53-B dated 8.2.54

The PEO. Mangalore is informed that the Panchayat Board of Yekkar is not sound enough financially to Contribute to works sanctioned to be executed in the its limits Except a token Contribution of Rs 200/- towards forming the road from Yekkar to Niddodi, the balance requires to Complete all the works, over and above the villagers Contribution may have to be met from CP. funds. if the road is taken from

Further expenditure on the Construction of a foot bridge at Melayekkar is being sanctioned separately.

The PEO is requested to urgently Submit detailed estimates for forming of the two roads, Yekkar to Niddodi and Permude to Mangalpet separately for Consideration. These estimates should give a correct assessment of the value of work already done by the villagers and the work still remaining to be done. It should also be reported in each case, how much of the remaining work will will be done by the beneficiaries and also whether the work will be carried out by the beneficiaries under the Supervision of the CP. Staff and according to standards.

18.3.54 18.3.54 18/3/54 18.3.54

P.A. to Asst Engr
19.3.54

ERJ 20-4-54

To
The P.E.O. Mangalore.
S.K. Dist

cover to file no 25 31/4/53.
RD. 1 enclosure

[RD 20-5-54]

for the katcha road from Perrude to Maruvalpet sanctioned in G.O.Ms.No.2960 Agriculture (C.P.), Department dated 31-10-1953. As the works are held for want of sanction to the Panchayat Board to incur the expenditure, the Inspector of Local Boards, Madras may kindly be requested to pass orders in all these cases at an early date.

13-2-54

Project Executive Officer.

Copy to the Inspector of Local Boards, Madras for favour of early necessary action.

f/12.2.

Pub (CF. Audit) Dept.

(C.No. 7869/53) Sub - Community Projects. South Kanara District.
Communications - Constructing a foot bridge at Helayekkar in Thenkayekkar Village.
Ref - From the PEO. Mangalore - rep. C No. 1105/53 A dt 15.4/53

Please see the letter from the PEO Mangalore at p1 CF. The PEO has enclosed an estimate for sanction. The proposal is to construct a wooden foot bridge on a masonry abutment, on the ~~right~~ left bank of the stream and wooden piles for the pier and right abutment. Surface boulders are available on the left bank and the subsoil is assumed to be rocky. The middle of stream and right bank are reported to be of Sandy Soil Hence piles are proposed for the right bank and for the pier. A reference to the Site Sketch and cross section furnished in the plan, makes it clear that the site is chosen on a ~~deep~~ sharp curve in the stream, with the outside of the curve on the left bank which is eroded almost to a vertical surface. While the right side of the stream and the bank on the inside of the curve are silted up. The putting up of a masonry abutment on the outer curve may hasten further erosion on the left bank and may result in the abutment being outflanked in a flood. It is therefore necessary to choose a fairly straight reach of the stream for the crossing and a suitable site may be available near by. The soil particulars ~~do not state~~ noted in the plan are vague and do not seem to be verified by probing or other examination, but the foundations are left to be finally decided upon during actual execution

The abstract of the estimate totals to Rs 3346, as against the Amount of Rs 4200. noted.

The above points will be brought out pointed out to the PEO for ~~est~~ clarification

The PEO will also be asked to limit the Amount of sanction required to the Average of Rs 1700 for a foot bridge, as approved in the Budget estimate.

Kept below. A draft memo returning the estimate to the PEO is put up for Approval

SR No 1.5.53 1/5

G 4/5/53

G 2/5/53

(D&Rec's Memo No. 7869 Pub(C.A.Audit)53-18. 2-5-53)

(From the PEO. Mangalore Lr. Cno 1105/53-B dated 26-6-53)

Please see the reply from the PEO. Mangalore at pg 5 cf.
The PEO has enclosed the AE's letter replying to all the technical queries raised in memo 7869 Pub(CP. Audit)53 dated 2-5-53. The AE has advanced plausible reasons for retaining the site chosen. It is reported that the site is not on so ~~deep a~~ sharp a curve of the stream, as the field sketch would give one to understand. It seems, there is a stretch of straight course to accommodate the site of the foot-bridge. Subsoil particulars are also furnished. The estimated cost is now Rs 3400, of which two thirds or Rs 2267 is required to be sanctioned. The PEO in his reply has stated that even though the expenditure involved is Rs 2267 against the average of Rs 1700 provided for the 33 foot bridges in the Project estimate, this may be made good by the ~~much~~ numerous works that have been sanctioned and may be proposed for far lesser amounts. This is not borne out by the expenditure sanctioned for a total of Rs 40412 for 20 foot bridges so far. The average has been Rs 2020/-. The provision for 33 foot bridges in the Project estimate is for an expenditure of Rs 57000., against the sanction accorded for Rs 40412. This work may be sanctioned out of the balance of Rs 16588/- available, as the PEO may not come up with proposals to the limit of the 33 foot bridges as foreseen, especially as only barely 3 months are left for the 1st year of development.

Subject to orders. a draft order is put up for approval. If approved, the estimate may also be Counter signed

Sr. No. 9-7-53

the may Sanction this estimate.

12/7/53

D.S. (3)7

Issued as Lgo. MS No. 1853 Public(CP. Audit)53 dt 14.7.53

66 2/3

2000
264
2264

Accounts — Yeskar Pr — South Kanara Dr — Rs 2,000/- Contribution to Community Projects Depot for formation of road from Yeskar to Riddodi.

From the Insptr of Pnl Cls & RBDs. Lr No. 63470/53 dt 21.12.53.

The Yeskar Panchayat, South Kanara Dr, has proposed to contribute a sum of Rs 2,000/- to the Community Projects depot. towards the cost of formation of a road from Yeskar to Riddodi within panchayat limits. The work is estimated to cost Rs 9,600 and private contributions are also expected. The Insptr of Pnl Cls & RBDs has stated that according to the BE for 1953-54 of the panchayat, the income is Rs 3052 only while the expenditure is Rs 4,278 and that the panchayat thus works at a deficit of Rs 1,226/- He has however stated that its bankers for 1953-54 closes with a balance of Rs 480/-. As the panchayat works at a deficit of Rs 1,226/-, he considers that the proposal contravenes condition no 5 in GO no. 1939 LAD dt 3.10.52 and he has sought for the orders of Govt.

2. According to the instructions in memo no. 24235/53-2. LAD dt 15.5.53, panchayats the finances of which are financially sound may contribute towards the Community projects works. In the present case the finances of the panchayat are poor. and therefore, a substantial contribution cannot be expected from

this panchayat. This depot may suggest that, as the BE for 1953-54 is expected to close with a balance of Rs 480, the panchayat may be asked to pay a nominal contribution of Rs 200/- (Rupees two hundred only). The remarks of Agri (C.P.) may be invited. This is a class II Panchayat with a poor income of almost Rs 3000/-.

AD(R) 12/1/54

JWS 12.1.54

lll 15.1.54

JJ 16/1/54 ADS

Agri (C.P.)

Agri (C.P.)

JJ 16/1/54

18.1.54

ACCOUNTS AND SPECIAL C... 18 JAN 1954 AGRICULTURE

HE(Agri) 77117.45/53-1 18.1.54

Agri (C.P. Audit)

5405

The work consists of 2 main parts 1) Earthwork in widening & forming the road 2) Construction of culverts. A sum of Rs 2400/- towards Construction of culverts only has been sanctioned to be spent from C.P. funds in G.O.M/s. 1183 Pub (C.P.) dated 5-5-1953. The approximate cost of earthwork etc for forming the road is Rs 9600, out of which the Panchayat board of Yekkar has resolved to contribute Rs 2000/- The balance is to be met by the beneficiaries. It is not known whether the beneficiaries will be able to form the road with only a nominal contribution of Rs 200/- by the Panchayat board, as suggested by H.E.(A). The matter may have to be referred to the PEO to find out whether the roads will be formed by the beneficiaries with a contribution of Rs 200/- only.

Put up addl draft to PEO.

JJ 20/1/54 No 20/1/54 S/21/1

S 23/1/54

Ur S.T. 25.1.54

R.C. 5409/54)

5

A draft memo, referring the matter to the PEO is put up for Approval

28-1-54

28.1.54 for 28/54

If the road work costs Rs 9600/- & the beneficiaries' contribution is estimated at Rs 7600/, we may grant Rs 1800/- to make up the difference between ~~the Panchayat~~ Rs 9600 & Rs 7600 less Rs 2000/- (Panchayat's Contribution). instead of taking out the work. we may await the reply to the D.O. memo

28/1/54.

Issued as Memo. No. 5409 Agri (C1 Audit) 54-1 dt 29-1-1954

Ref:- From the P.E.O., Mangalore Reg. C. No. 932/53. dt. 8.2.54

Please see the letter from the PEO. Mangalore at p 39 c/f He reports that the beneficiaries may not be able to complete the work of forming the road estimated to cost Rs 9600/-, within the promised Contribution of Rs 2000/- from the Panchayat Board.

The PEO also states that according to the President of the Panchayat board, the board has enough funds not only to meet the expenditure on this work, but also for two other works already sanctioned by us. But this is contrary to the actual State of its finances as noted by HELA at p 2 ante. Hence it is for consideration whether the meeting of the expenditure of Rs 1800/- requires from CP. funds may not involve the meeting of expenditure on the other two works for which also Contribution by the Panchayat board were expected.

Sunil Can

If it is later decided to meet the expenditure from CP. funds the usual procedure of sanctioning the estimate will have to be gone through, since the estimates for the culverts only were considered and sanctioned previously

For orders

Sd/-

1983 Lab (CP) 53/ of (N) in L.F. Folio.

Put up a list of

Resubmitted. The list of works to which the Panchayat board has promised Contribution is as below.

Name of work.	Estimated cost	Amount of Contribution
1. Yekkar Niddodi road.	Rs 9600/-	Rs 2000/
2. Foot bridge at Melayekkar	Rs 3400	Rs 1133/
3. Road from Permude to Manjalpet.	~~Rs 3400/-~~	~~Rs 1133/-~~
	Rs 12500	—

By these, the sanction accorded for an expenditure of Rs 12500/- is to meet fully the cost of a bridge & paved dip on the road from Permude to Manjalpet. The road of 3 miles is to be formed by the villagers with help from the Panchayat board and it is not known how much help is expected from the Panchayat board. It is however seen from the report of the P.E.O received with his letter dated 23-2-54 that in this case with the contribution expected is Rs. 12500/-

Please see the progress report 25/3/54

Resubmitted. The progress report for January '54 shows that the materials required for the foot-bridge at Mela-Yekkar are being gathered at site. Further progress cannot be expected until funds can be found to meet the deficiency of Rs 1133/-.

Progress on the two roads. Yekkar-Niddodi road and Permude Manjalpet road are not known. These are being carried out by the people themselves. No proper estimates for the formation of the two roads were framed or approved. If instead of the Panchayat board, C.P. funds are to be spent in completing the two road works, it may become necessary to frame correct detailed estimates of the value of work actually done and remaining to be done on the two roads, with proposals for the amount of help required from C.P. funds.

The P.E.O may be asked to send such detailed estimates for the 2 roads and told that the full cost of the work of constructing the foot-bridge may be met from C.P. funds. Orders in this direction may be issued

For orders.

1.3.54

1.3.54 A draft memo to sanction the additional expenditure of Rs 133 for the foot bridge and a second memo calling for detailed estimates for completing the two roads, are put up for approval